

Serial No. 08/584,477

REMARKS

This is in reply to the final Office Action mailed August 22, 2001. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

It is respectfully requested that this after-final reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-13 were pending in this reissue application. By way of the present amendment, Applicants have submitted new claims 10, 11 and 12. Also, claim 13, which was added by way of the reply filed April 20, 2001, has been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-12 are presently pending for further consideration.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 5 and 6 contain allowable subject matter.

With respect to the comments made in numbered paragraph 1) of the Office Action, applicants' representative will continue to search for the original ribboned copy of the patent, and will provide it, when found. If it cannot be found, an affidavit or declaration will be filed as to the loss or inaccessibility of the original ribboned copy of the patent.

In the Office Action, claims 10-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons as set forth in numbered paragraph 3) of the Office Action. Newly submitted claim 10 removes the offending

Serial No. 08/584,477

language mentioned in the Office Action, and thus it is believed that claim 10, as well as its dependent claims, fully comply to the requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Due to the cancellation of claim 13, the rejection of that claim is now moot.

Claims 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,463,656 to Polivka et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,289,272 to Rabowsky et al. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,463,656 to Polivka et al. and Rabowsky et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,495,258 to Muhlhauser. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Polivka et al., Rabowsky et al., and Muhlhauser, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,866,515 to Tagawa et al. Claims 8, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Polivka et al., Rabowsky et al., and Muhlhauser. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

With respect to independent claim 10, that claim recites that the receiver does not perform any decoding and does not perform any D/A converting of the downconverted RF signals obtained from the antenna controller. Independent claim 12 recites that no decoding and no D/A converting are performed by the downconverting step, the processing step, the modulating step, the distributing step, and the receiving step. Support for these added features to claims

Serial No. 08/584,477

10 and 12 may be found in column 3, lines 57-58 of the printed patent.

These features of claims 10 and 12 are not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited art of record. In particular, Polivka's receiver performs decoding, by way of elements 295, 301 and 311 in Figure 3A of Polivka. Note in particular that Video Reconstruction Unit (Decompression) 311 is provide upstream from the on board video monitors, as described in Figure 3 of Polivka. This element is not a part of Polivka's seat electronics circuitry.

Thus, even if Polivka could be combined with Rabowsky, which applicants' feel cannot be done properly, the combined system would provide a receiver that performs decoding, prior to sending signals to passenger seats.

Also, Rabowsky's system only processes entertainment signals supplied from within an aircraft, such as one supplied by a VCR housed within the aircraft. Thus, Rabowsky's system is not pertinent to a system that receives entertainment signals provided from outside the aircraft, such as is done in Polivka's system and in the present invention.

Put in another way, Rabowsky's optional decompression circuitry 130, 131, provided at his passenger seat system (see Figure 3 of Rabowsky), is provided because Rabowsky's front end system provides compression circuitry, as shown by elements 90 and 92 in Figure 2 of Rabowsky. Thus, Rabowsky's processing front end provides decoding of entertainment audio and video signals, and thus is not

Serial No. 08/584,477

pertinent to the claimed invention, which does not perform such processing prior to the signals being sent to a passenger seat system.

Since the other cited art of record does not rectify the deficiencies of Polivka and Rabowsky, claims 10-12 are patentable.

Furthermore, dependent claim 11 recites that the control signals used to steer the aircraft are based on either a GPS navigation system or an aircraft navigation system, and are not based on any signals output from the receiver. Thus, unlike Polivka's system, which uses feedback by way of a signal output from Polivka's receiver stage 280-1 on line 305 in Figure 3A to Polivka's Control Processor 270 (to be used to control the phased array antennas 265R, 266R), the present invention according to claim 11 does not provide such feedback. The present invention as recited in claim 11 provides a faster, more direct way of steering the antenna, without having to wait for signals to be processed by a downstream receiver, whereby those processed signals would be used to control the antenna's steering.

Therefore, claim 11 is patentable for this additional reason.

With respect to independent claim 1, that claim recites a receiver that processes downconverted RF signals to provide encoded video and audio output signals corresponding to a plurality of television channels.

Also, seat electronics circuitry, located downstream

Serial No. 08/584,477

from the processor, provides demodulation, decoding, and D/A converting. Therefore, it is clear from this claim that the features performed by the claimed seat electronics circuitry, are not performed by the receiver, since it would not make sense to have to do it in the receiver, undo it somewhere between the receiver and the seat electronics circuitry, and then redo it ("it" being demodulating, decoding, and D/A converting) at the seat electronics circuitry.

As explained above, Polivka's system includes a receiver that performs these functions, while the receiver of claim 1 (see Figure 4 of the drawings, for example) does not perform these functions.

Method claim 9 recites similar functions of demodulating, decoding, and D/A converting that are performed at seat electronics circuitry, and thus for the same reasons given above, these functions are not performed by an upstream receiver.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable for these reasons, since the other cited art of record do not overcome the deficiencies of Polivka.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentable and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 08/584,477

A Third Supplemental Reissue Declaration is being submitted concurrently herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Nov. 19, 2001

Date

Kyle Eppeler

Kyle Eppeler  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,155

Rockwell Collins  
Intellectual Property Division  
400 Collins Road, NE, M/S 124/323  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Customer No.: 26383